

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 20 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the revised drawings:

The label "Prior Art" was added to Figures 1 to 3.

The reference numbers 40 and 53 were added to Figure 5.

Attachment structure 53 to attach replacement cover 40 to the power port assembly was added to Figure 5 as requested. Since the addition is consistent with, at least, page 10, paragraph 0028, first sentence, (existing bracketing and attachment points {e.g. mounting holes} are used), no new matter was added.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 to 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 1, since the claimed attachment to existing structure of the power port assembly, as set forth in claim 1 is supported by, at least, page 10, paragraph 0028, first sentence, the claimed limitation is indeed described in the

specification. Additionally, because the existing structure itself is readily available for inspection by those of skilled in the art (on a plethora of commercial aircraft), attachment to such existing structure is within the skill of those skilled in the art.

Accordingly, the rejected subject matter is described in the specification in a way to enable one skill in the art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon, claims 2 to 8, be withdrawn.

For reasons similar to those set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 9 and 15 and the claims dependent thereon, claims 10 to 14 and 16 to 18 respectfully, be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 to 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Robinson (U.S. Patent No. 4,509,097), Spielman (U.S. Patent No. 3,019,050), Gevaert (U.S. Patent No. 6,179,381), Pritchard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,124), Luu (U.S. Patent No. 5,384,428) and Thompson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,114,365). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, the Office Action states that it would have been obvious to form the cover with plural connections. Yet neither Robinson, Spielman, Gevaert, Pritchard, Luu, nor Thompson teach or suggest a cover and additional connectors weighing less than an amount which would require recertification, as set forth in claim 1.

With respect to Pritchard, Luu, and Thompson, these references are directed to wall plates which do not require recertification. Accordingly they are silent regarding the weight being less than an amount which would require recertification.

Similarly, Gevaert is directed to stationarily mounted seating structures mounted to the floor of an auditorium, theater or the like (see column 1, lines 21 to 22). Accordingly, Gavaert is also silent regarding the weight being less than an amount which would require recertification.

Additionally, Robinson is directed toward one passenger control unit instead of two individual control units. Thus, Robinson is silent regarding the weight of additional connectors with a weight being less than an amount which would require recertification.

In contrast, Speilman teaches ~~a weight increase associated with relocating facilities from the ceiling to the seats. Speilman locates at least a light, light switch, oxygen mask, an air outlet control valve, a service call button, and three other plugs to the seat (see column 2, lines 56 to 66).~~ Such a weight increase necessitates recertification. Thus, Speilman teaches away from a weight increase less than an amount which would require recertification, as set forth in claim 1. Accordingly, it is also impermissible to combine Speilman to reject the present invention.

Since the references either teach away from the present invention (Speilman) or are silent regarding ~~a weight increase of less than an amount which would require recertification (Robinson, Pritchard, Luu, Thompson, and Gavaert)~~ as set forth in claim 1, a *prima facie* case has not been set forth. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon, claims 1 to 8, be withdrawn.

For reasons similar to those set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 9 and 15 and the claims dependent thereon, claims 10 to 14 and 16 to 18, be respectively withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/18/03

By: R. Villard
Robert L. Villard
Reg. No. 53,725

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600